



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2022

by M Chalk BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W3520/W/21/3276572

Land adjacent to Deerbolt Cottage, All Saints Road, Creting St. Mary, Suffolk, IP6 8PJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G and Mrs D S Baker against the decision of Mid Suffolk District Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/00446, dated 22 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1No. single storey dwelling including forming new vehicle access from highway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. This appeal seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved. All submitted plans have therefore been treated as indicative only.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the setting of Deerbolt Cottage, a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

4. Deerbolt Cottage has been identified by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset. It is a rendered cottage with a tiled roof that has two small dormers set into the front slope. The house appears to date from the 18th century and retains much of its traditional form and proportions. The significance of the property derives from its historic architectural value as well as its relationship to its spacious rural setting.
5. There is intermittent development along All Saints Road in the vicinity of the appeal site. Most houses directly face the road, but the nearest neighbour, Tanronen, is set at an angle and partly to the rear of Deerbolt Cottage. While this is an unusual alignment in the wider area, it does help to preserve the prominence of Deerbolt Cottage in the street scene with the newer house set further back from the road. Similarly, the annexe to Deerbolt Cottage is set to its rear with a smaller footprint and lower roofline than the host property.
6. The existing cottage occupies a wide plot with substantial garden space to either side. Both the annexe and Tanronen lie to one side of the cottage, and the appeal site lies to this side as well. The introduction of a further building in

this area would reduce the open and rural nature of the setting of the cottage, which reflects the open fields on the opposite side of the road.

7. This appeal seeks outline permission, with the scale, layout and detailed appearance of the proposed dwelling all reserved matters. However, any new dwelling on this site would diminish its open and spacious character, causing harm to the setting of Deerbolt Cottage contrary to Policy CS5 of the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy 2008 and Policy HB1 of the Mid Suffolk Local Plan 1998. I shall return to this matter below.

Other Matters

8. An outbuilding could be constructed within the appeal site under Deerbolt Cottage's permitted development rights. However, the use of such a building would be restricted to a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, and there is already an annexe within its grounds. It is not therefore clear how such a building would relate to a potential dwellinghouse on this site in terms of height, siting or footprint. This therefore attracts very limited weight in my determination of this appeal.

Planning Balance

9. The appellant contends that both Policy CS5 and Policy HB1 are out of date. The relevant wording of Policy CS5 seeks to protect, conserve and where possible enhance the built historic environment. This goes further than the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which states that local planning authorities should take account of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets. Accordingly, the conflict with this policy attracts diminished weight in the planning balance. Similarly, the wording of Policy HB1 is not consistent with the Framework, and therefore the conflict with it also attracts diminished weight.
10. Nevertheless, the Framework requires that in weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
11. In this instance there would be a benefit from the creation of one new dwellinghouse in a sustainable location which could be delivered in a short timescale. This would support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. While the Council is able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, this does not diminish the value of additional housing. There would be a short-term economic benefit from the construction of the dwelling, and longer term from its occupation, which would also help support local services and facilities. Appropriately worded conditions could secure sustainable construction measures and landscaping to deliver biodiversity improvements as part of the development. These considerations weigh in favour of the development, but as the proposal is for a single dwelling they amount to modest weight overall.
12. The benefits of the development must be weighed against the harm to the setting of the cottage. The appeal seeks outline permission and therefore the scale of development would be subject to control at reserved matters stage. However, even a modest dwellinghouse in this location would detract from the setting of the cottage by eroding the open and spacious character of the site.

Given the existing presence of the annexe and Tanronen to this side of the cottage and the importance to the significance of the cottage of its setting, this attracts considerable weight in the overall balance, and outweighs the benefits that the appeal proposal would deliver.

13. While the most important development plan policies are out of date, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the setting of Deerbolt Cottage. The adverse impacts of granting permission would therefore significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal fails.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR